PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

REC'D	0 8	MAY	2006
MIDO			PC:

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY
(Chapter II of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

Applicant' s or agent' s file reference	FOR FURTHER ACT	rion	See Form PCT/IPEA/416			
MCEA-P5-04 International application No.	International filing date (a	iov/month (vear)	Priority date (day/month/year)			
	1		05 November 2003 (05.11.2003)			
PCT/US04/37000 04 November 2004 (04.11.2004) 05 November 2003 (05.11.2003) International Patent Classification (IPC) or national classification and IPC						
IPC: G06Q 40/00 (2006.01) USPC: 705/4,35,38						
Applicant						
CABALLERO, CRISPINA						
Examining Authority under	er Article 35 and transmi	tted to the applicant a				
2. This REPORT consists of	f a total of 4 sheets, incl	luding this cover she	et.			
3. This report is also accomp	-					
a. (sent to the applica	ant and to the Internation	al Bureau) a total of	15 sheets, as follows:			
sheets of the of this repo	sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis of this report and/or sheets containing rectifications authorized by this Authority (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions).					
amendment	ch supersede earlier sh that goes beyond the item 4 of Box No. I and	disclosure in the in	nis Authority considers contain an nternational application as filed, as x.			
b. (sent to the Inter	rnational Bureau only) a t	total of (indicate type	and number of electronic carrier(s))			
, containing a sequence listing and/or tables related thereto, in electronic form only, as indicated in the Supplemental Box Relating to Sequence Listing (see Section 802 of the Administrative Instructions).						
4. This report contains indic	ations relating to the follo	owing items:				
Box No. I B	asis of the report					
Box No. II Pi	Box No. II Priority					
Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability						
Box No. IV L	Lack of unity of invention					
Enumeral Control of the Control of t	Box No. V Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement					
Box No. VI C	ertain documents cited		·			
Box No. VII C	ertain defects in the inter	national application				
Box No. VIII C	ertain observations on the	e international applic	ation			
Date of submission of the demand Date of completion of this report						
22 December 2005 (22.12.2005)		20 February 2006 (20.02.2006)				
Name and mailing address of the IPEA/US Mail Stop PCT, Attn: IPEA/US Anthorized officer						
Commissioner for Patents	Я	Joseph Thomas				
P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 Example No. (571) 273 2201	\mathcal{O}	/ Telephone No. 571-2	272-3600			
Facsimile No. (571) 273-3201						

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

PCT/US04/37000

Box No.	. I Basis of the report					
1. With	regard to the language, this report is based on:					
\boxtimes	the international application in the language in which it was filed.					
	a translation of the international application into, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of:					
	international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b))					
	publication of the international application (under Rule 12.4(a))					
	international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2(a) and/or 55.3(a))					
2. With regard to the elements of the international application, this report is based on (replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as "o riginally filed" and are not annexed to this report):						
H	the international application as originally filed/furnished					
	the description: pages 1-19 as originally filed/furnished					
	pages* NONE received by this Authority on					
	pages* NONE received by this Authority on					
\boxtimes	the claims: pages NONE as originally filed/furnished					
	pages* NONE as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19					
	pages* 20-32 received by this Authority on 22 December 2005					
K3	pages* NONE received by this Authority on					
\bowtie	the drawings:					
	pages 1-17 as originally filed/furnished pages* NONE received by this Authority on					
	pages* NONE received by this Authority on pages* NONE received by this Authority on					
	a sequence listing and/or any related table(s) - see Supplemental Box Relating to Sequence Listing.					
3. 🔲	The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:					
	the description, pages					
	the claims, Nos					
	the drawings, sheets/figs					
	the sequence listing (specify):					
	any table(s) related to the sequence listing (specify):					
4.	This report has been established as if (some of) the amendments annexed to this report and listed below had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).					
	the description, pages					
	the claims, Nos					
	the drawings, sheets/figs					
	the sequence listing (specify):					
	any table(s) related to the sequence listing (specify):					
* If item	4 applies, some or all of those sheets may be marked "superseded."					

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

International application No. PCT/US04/37000

Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial
	applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement		
Novelty (N)	Claims 1-67	YES
	Claims NONE	NO
Inventive Step (IS)	Claims NONE	YES
• • •	Claims 1-67	NO NO
Industrial Applicability (IA)	Claims 1-67	YES
	Claims NONE	NO

2. Citations and Explanations (Rule 70.7)
Claims 1-67 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Best-Devereux (US 2002/0082875) in view of Hammond et al (US 5,712,984).

Best-Devereux discloses a system and method for distributing risk among selected assumers for reinsurance negations (See abstract, Fig 3, par. 0026-0033). Best-Devereux further discloses that the submitting party or parties and the ceding company may negotiate the portion of risk that the potential reinsurer is willing to assume through a series of offers and counteroffers (par. 0036-0043). Furthermore, Best-Devereux discloses that the information exchanged among the parties may include various high liability/high price and low liability/low cost options (par. 0089), but does not expressly disclose the steps of calculating an insurance reserve requirement to determine capital requirements for the insurer.

Hammond discloses a system and method for predicting/calculating required insurance cash reserves. (col. 14, line 4-col. 16, line 22) Hammond further discloses that the reserve amount may be adjusted and reproportioned as needed. (col. 17, line 16-col. 18, line 19) At the time of the applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method and system of Best-Devereux with the teaching of Hammond to calculate and allocate the required insurance reserves. As suggested by Hammond, one would have been motivated to include this feature to allow insurers to budget and forecast more accurately, thereby reducing potential losses and improving the overall financial solvency of the insurance carrier. (col. 2, lines 6-11)

Claims 1-67 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus have industrial applicability because the subject matter claimed can be made or used in industry.

The applicant's arguments regarding the applied references have been considered, but are not persuasive. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references.

The Applicant further suggests that Hammond is non-analogous art, because it is directed toward worker's compensation, not reinsurance. In response to applicant's argument that Hammond is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. In the present case, the Examiner submits that the worker's compensation functions a type of insurance for individuals who have been individuals who have been injured at the workplace. Moreover, "reinsurance" is merely insurance for insurance companies. Therefore, both the prior art and the claimed invention deal in the area of insurance. Moreover, both the prior and the applicant's invention address the issue of raising and allocating sufficient reserves for insurance purposes. As such, the Hammond reference is analogous to the problem being addressed and to the applicant's field of endeavor.

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

International application No.

Box No. VII	Certain	defects in	the	international	application
		~~~~~			appacauon

Form PCT/IPEA/409 (Box No. VII) (April 2005)

The following defects in the form or contents of the international application have been noted:  Claim 61 is objected to under PCT Rule 66.2(a)(iii) as containing the following defect(s) in the form or contents thereof: Two claims have been numbered "claim 61."						
			•			
	·					
		·				•